

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the subject matter recited in claim 11. In addition, claim 1 has been further amended to further clarify that an adapter/stub can function as an adapter or a stub in a runtime environment (see, for example, the Abstract of the invention). It should be noted that a determination can be made as to whether to provide an interpreter to compiled code (I/C) adapter or a compiled code to interpreter (C/I) adapter. An Interpreter to compiled code (I/C) adapter can facilitate translation of a first execution stack so that it can be used to execute compiled code. A compiled code to interpreter (C/I) adapter can facilitate translation of an execution stack so that it can be used by an interpreter (see, Specification, pages 15-16, and Figure 6 of the present application).

The Examiner's rejection is traversed for the following reasons:

a) *McQuistan et al.* does NOT teach or suggest an adapter that can facilitate translation of an execution stack (Claim 1)

It is noted that the interpreter described by *McQuistan et al.* "creates an argument stack for a function completely at runtime." (*McQuistan et al.*, Col. 7, lines 4-25). Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that *McQuistan et al.* does NOT teach translating an execution stack. Clearly, *McQuistan et al.* describes an argument stack and not an execution stack that can be used for compiled code. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does NOT teach or suggest an adapter that can facilitate translation of an execution stack.

b) The cited art does NOT teach or suggest an adapter/stub that can behave as an adapter or a stub for a virtual machine (Claim 1)

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art does NOT teach this feature. In fact, the cited art does NOT teach an adapter between compiled code and interpreter in the context of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art for this additional reason.

c) The cited art does NOT teach or suggest determining whether to provide an interpreter to compiled code (I/C) adapter or a compiled code to interpreter (C/I) adapter (Claim 1)

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable for yet this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P231C1). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300